2006 Annual Adjustment (Reassessment) Sales Ratio Study Checklist 12/4/2008

Attachment "B"

COUNTY: LaPorte County

Pursuant to 50 IAC 14-5-3 the Department of Local Government Finance has made an initial review of your study. Our review indicates the study is missing the following information:									
An electronic spreadsheet of all supporting data was not included. See 50 IAC 14-8-1									
X	The backup documentation was mix Parcel Number AV Land AV Impr. Date of Sale Sale Price A ratio study was not included for t			Township X Pivot Table Co. Tax Dist. # DLGF Tax Dist # Condition Rating				oroperty: X Grade Code # only X Sales/Parcel Data X List of sales See 50 IAC 14-8-1	
L. .		Township	Res Imp	Res Unimp	Comm Impr	Comm Unimp	Ind Impr	Ind Unimp	Ag
You did not provide the following statistics for all classes in all townships: Count of Sales included in the analysis See 50 IAC 14-5-2(a) Median See 50 IAC 14-6-1 Coefficient of Dispersion See 50 IAC 14-7-1 Confidence Interval; if required See 50 IAC 14-5-2(c) Price Related Differential See 50 IAC 21-11-1(b)									

Other:

Residential Improved:

- Cass Township: Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) = 19.33 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards)
- Center Township: There are six (6) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (050636343003; 050634476028; 050634480003; 051002106015; 051001110006; and 040615200019).
 However, when removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect.
- Coolspring Township: There are five (5) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (140503252005; 130504104009; 140503226017; 140503230008; and 140503230007).
 Like Center Township, when removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect.
- Dewey Township: COD = 16.40 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards)
- O Galena Township: COD= 18.90 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards); Price Related Differential (PRD) =1.03 (This is at the high end or exceeds the IAAO standards)
- O Hanna Township: COD = 17.60 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards). There are two (2) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (241808261002 and 241824100018). One of the sales for 241824100018 is dated 4/4/2006. If this sale is being used, was it time adjusted for a 1/1/2005 valuation date? When these two (2) duplicate sales are removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there APPEARS to be a material effect of taking the calculated COD from 17.51 to 14.56 based on our calculations.
- o Kankakee Township: COD = 17.30 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards)
 - Note: For Kankakee Township, the vendor miscalculated the COD by including two (2) individual pieces of a multi-parcel sale when calculating the absolute variance number. We have determined that the COD should calculate to a figure of 15.41 (which just meets the IAAO acceptable standard).
 - There is one (1) sale that appears to be a duplicate sale (320722100053). When this duplicate sale is removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there APPEARS to be a material effect of taking our calculated COD from 15.41 to 15.56. Note: The only difference between these sales is one has a grade of "C" while the duplicate has a grade of "C+2".
- Lincoln Township: COD = 17.20 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards)
- Michigan Township: PRD =1.03 (this is at the high end of the acceptable limit). There are eight (8) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (420128456008; 420129393005; 420133202022; 420128378019; 420133129002; 420128314001[listed a total of three (3) times, same sale date of 12/9/2004, but with three (3) different grades for each "C"

,"C+1", and "C+2"]; 420113109013; and 450115455003). When removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect. Please note, however, that for the first five (5) sales, the only difference is either a change to the grade or condition of the property. In five (5) of the multi-parcel sales, the total of the land and improvements do not add up to the assessed value total used to compute the ratio. One of the assessed values was \$1,000,000 different than the assessed value used. The changes did not have a material effect, except that the PRD was at 1.04.

- New Durham Township: COD = 17.20 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards); PRD =1.03
 (This is at the high end or exceeds the IAAO standards)
- Pleasant Township: There are two (2) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (561114201008 and 571106131017). When removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect.
- o Prairie Township: COD = 16.40 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards)
- O Springfield Township: COD = 16.20 (Outside acceptable IAAO standards); PRD = 1.03 (This is at the high end or exceeds the IAAO standards)

• Residential Vacant:

- Center Township: PRD =1.03 (at the high end of the standard). The county's sales count is 94 and it appears there are 98 sales. There are four (4) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (040621300039; 040617100110; 040617100111; and 040615200030). When removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect.
- Coolspring Township: There are five (5) sales that appear to be duplicate sales (110531100055; 110535200034; 110534100028; 130506105001; and 130504276034).
 When removed from the study for a "what if" scenario, there is no material effect.
- Lincoln Township: PRD = 1.03 (This is at the high end or above the IAAO standards)
- Michigan Township: PRD = 1.03 (This is at the high end or above the IAAO standards)
- Washington Township: COD = 19.80 (This is at the high end or above the IAAO standards)

• Commercial Improved:

- Please note that condition and grades were not included in the Commercial and Industrial improved studies.
- o Center Township: COD = 18.90 (This is at the high end or above the IAAO standards)